

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Attached hereto are four (4) sheets of corrected formal drawings that comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.84. The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

**In Fig. 1**, the organic luminescent layer 140 is amended to illustrate the stacked organic luminescent layers.

**Fig. 6** has been added to show the feature that the first nanostructured organic electroluminescent recovery layer 520 is on the first electrode 530 and is between the first electrode and the organic luminescent layer 540.

**Fig. 7 and 8** have been added to show the feature that the second nanostructured organic electroluminescent recovery layer 560 is on the organic luminescent layer 540 and is between the organic luminescent layer 540 and the second electrode 550.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approval and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-34 are now present in the application. The specification, drawings, and claims 1, 22-25, and 27-30 have been amended. Claims 21 and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 30 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Drawings Objections**

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicants have submitted four (4) sheets of corrected formal drawings to address the Examiner's requested changes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's drawings objections are respectfully requested.

### **Specification**

The specification has been amended to conform with the amendments to the drawings. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is entered. Entry of the above amendments to the specification is earnestly solicited.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the term “nanoscale” is known in the art. For example, U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0151030 and U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2005/0040370 refer to the term “nanoscale” for particles having a mean average diameter of less than 1 micron meter and, more particularly, having a mean average diameter of less than 100 nanometers (see). In addition, the term “nanoscale” as defined in <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=nanoscale> means “having dimensions measured in nanometers”. In view of the above, one skilled in the art will understand the term “nanoscale” recited in claims based on the specification of the instant application.

Accordingly, all pending claims comply with the enablement requirement. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, and 5-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Raychaudhuri, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0140758. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 30 have been amended.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements including “a nanostructured organic electroluminescent recovery layer, comprising dielectric or organic material, doped with

nanoscale metal particles, wherein the nanoscale metal particle is different from the dielectric or organic material”.

Independent claim 30 recites a combination of elements including “a first nanostructured organic electroluminescent recovery layer comprising first dielectric or organic material, doped with first nanoscale metal particles, wherein the first nanoscale metal particle is different from the first dielectric or organic material” and “a second nanostructured organic electroluminescent recovery layer comprising second dielectric or organic material, doped with second nanoscale metal particles, wherein the second nanoscale metal particle is different from the second dielectric or organic material.”

Support for the above combinations of elements can be found on page 7, lines 11-30, and page 8, lines 1-6 of the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combinations of elements as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 30 are not disclosed nor suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

As recited in amended claims 1, and 30, among the other things, the organic electroluminescent recovery layer comprises dielectric or organic material doped with second nanoscale metal particles. Specifically, the nanoscale metal particle is different from the dielectric or organic material. The nanoscale metal particle is distributed within the dielectric or organic layer. In other words, the nanoscale metal particle serves as dopant for the dielectric or organic layer.

Raychaudhuri on paragraph 0068 teaches a transmission enhancement layer including conductive or nonconductive materials including but not limited to: ITO, indium zinc oxide (IZO), tin oxide (TO), antimony-doped tin oxide (ATO), fluorine-doped tin oxide (FTO), indium

oxide (IO), zinc oxide (ZO), cadmium stannate (CTO), cadmium oxide, phosphorus-doped TO, and aluminum-doped ZO, MgO, MoO<sub>x</sub>, SiO<sub>2</sub>, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, TiO<sub>2</sub>, ZrO<sub>2</sub>, SiN, AlN, TiN, ZrN, SiC, or Al<sub>4</sub>C<sub>3</sub>, or mixtures thereof. However, Raychaudhuri fails to teach that the transmission enhancement layer is doped with any dopant such as a nanoscale metal particle as recited in amended claims 1 and 30. Accordingly, Raychaudhuri fails to teach the above combinations of elements as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 30.

Since Raychaudhuri fails to teach each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1 and 30 or their dependent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 30 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of Raychaudhuri. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/644,975  
Amendment dated December 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 27, 2005

Docket No.: 0941-0814P

Page 15 of 15

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Replacement Sheets